

REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on March 20, 2006, made Final. Claims 1-17 and 19 are standing for examination. Claims 1-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Further, claims 1-6, 15-16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light in view of the new reference of Burson (U.S. 6,405,245), hereinafter Burson. Claims 7, 9-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light, in view of Burson as applied to claims 1 and 3, and further in view of Jacobs of record. Claims 8, 13 and 17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light in view of Burson as applied to claims 1, 3, 9, 10 and 13, and further in view of Kraft of record.

Applicant has again carefully studied the prior art references provided by the Examiner and the Examiner's rejections and statements of the instant Office Action. In response to the merit rejections of applicant's claims, applicant provides further argument which will clearly demonstrate that applicant's claims are clearly taught and enabled in applicant's specification distinguishing unarguably over the prior art presented by the Examiner, either singly or in combination.

Regarding the 112 rejection, the Examiner states that having the user request to view summary information for the site after the registration process for that site is complete before being able to add summary information from non-solicited sites or sites the user is not registered to is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). The newly added limitation states that the registration notification of the independent claims now includes, "...summarized information pertinent to the user including links to or information from alternate sites not solicited by, or registered to by the user," which is not enabled by the specification without taking steps prior to supplying this user with this information. The specification

does not assert that the registration notification could include this additional information, rather the specification discloses specifically "...if a user requests summary about data on one of his sites such as, perhaps, current interest rates and re-finance costs at his mortgage site, the service may at it's own discretion provide an additional unsolicited summary from an alternate mortgage site for comparison," (page 32, lines 7-16 of applicant's specification) as a basis for when to provide unsolicited summaries.

Applicant argues that, as admitted by the Examiner above, the specification clearly teaches that if a user requests summary about data on one of his sites such as, perhaps, current interest rates and re-finance costs at his mortgage site, the service may at it's own discretion provide an additional unsolicited summary from an alternate mortgage site for comparison. Further, applicant's specification clearly teaches that a data return module 265 is provided to return successful registration information including user notification thereof and record of successful and accepted values submitted for future log-in purposes. In some cases, accepted values may be immediately used by the service to log-in on behalf of a user and to obtain data from the site for a user if directed to do so by XML order (p.67, lines 3-8). Clearly, one with skill in the art could readily appreciate this tangible teaching as enabling said limitation reciting " user notification is sent to the user by the software application and includes registration status and authentication data accepted by the hosted site, and summarized information pertinent to the user, including links to or information from alternate sites not solicited by, or registered to by the user" as clearly taught in applicant's specification.

The Examiner continues: "It is noted that this statement requires that the registration process for the site must have been completed and that a separate request for data must be generated to view summaries, at which point the summary data of unsolicited sites may be added to the output document. However, the claim states that as a part of the registration process, i.e. the notification that registration has completed, is where this data is presented even though the specification is silent to this fact. Additional information on providing unsolicited summaries is provided by that applicant in the

specification (page 37, line 26-page 38, line 6 of applicant's specification) however, just as earlier in the specification the summary data is not included as part of a notification of registration. The applicant must either correct the claims to enable them or specifically point out where in the specification this limitation can be properly drawn, a mere allegation that the limitations as presented are enabled will not be enough to overcome this rejection.

Applicant strongly argues that the summary request is part of the claimed instruction order and the unsolicited information is unarguably disclosed as being provided in response to a summary request by a user from a specific Web site upon registering the user. The Examiner's above assertion does not consider this connection and functionality as taught in applicant's specification (see at least pg. 57 lines 9-14; pg. 67, lines 3-8; pg. 32, lines 7-16). Applicant points out that the user does not need to register to the site or solicit the information, therefore the claim is accurate and fairly taught in applicant's specification. Therefore, the Examiner's 112 rejection is unfounded and applicant respectfully requests it be withdrawn.

Regarding the merit rejections under 103, applicant's invention teaches that if a user requests a summary about data on one of his sites to which he has already registered, such as, perhaps, current interest rates and re-finance costs at his mortgage site, the service may at its own discretion provide an additional unsolicited summary from an alternate mortgage site for comparison. This type of summarization would be designed to enhance a user's position based on his profile information. In this case, updated data about latest interest rates, stock performances, car prices, airline ticket discounts, and so on would be stored by the service for comparative purposes. If a user request for a summary can be equaled or bettered in terms of any advantage to the user, such summary data may be included.

The sites are parsed for summary data, stored in canonical fashion by the service and the data is compiled and rendered for presentation to the end user on a summary

page. The summary containing all of the data is made available to a user and the user is notified of its existence. The clear advantage over the prior art is that by providing certain information not requested by a user may aid in enhancing a user's organization of his current business on the WEB, and such summarization enhances a user's position based on his profile information.

As argued above, applicant's limitation including; " characterized in that the instruction order contains all of the required instruction data for navigating to and registering the user to the site, including authentication data for secure login, if required, and further characterized in that the user notification is sent to the user by the software application and includes registration status and authentication data accepted by the hosted site, and summarized information pertinent to the user, including links to or information from alternate sites not solicited by, or registered to by the user" is enabled and the 112 rejection should be withdrawn as argued above. The Examiner must now fully consider and give patentable weight to said limitation or provide prior art to teach said limitation. The art provided by the Examiner, either singly or in combination, fails to teach said limitation.

Applicant therefore strongly believes that independent claims 1, 9, 15 and 19, which specifically recite that the notification to the user includes summarized information pertinent to the user, including links to or information from alternate sites not solicited by, or registered to by the user, provide the user with clear advantages over the system and method taught in the combined art of Light/Burson, and now clearly differentiate applicant's invention over the combined art and should be afforded patentable weight by the Examiner. All of the remaining dependent claims are therefore patentable on their own merits, or at least as dependent from a patentable claim.

As all of applicant's claims as amended and argued above have been shown to be patentable over the combined prior art provided by the Examiner, applicant respectfully requests that this application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and that this case be

passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Anand Rangarajan et al.

By *Donald R. Boys*
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency
3 Hangar Way, Suite D
Watsonville, CA 95076
831-768-1755